

REMARKS

The applicant extends his appreciation to Examiner Boris Pesin for discussing, on May 31, 2005, possible amendments to overcome the cited prior art of the last Office Action. In addition, Examiner Pesin indicated the term "worksite," as claimed, required further clarification.

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Final Office Action mailed May 5, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-29 remain in this application. Claims 3 and 17 are cancelled. Claims 1, 15 and 28 have been amended. Claims 3, 5, 14, 16 and 18-27 remain as previously presented. New claim 29 has been added. No new matter has been added. It is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. As discussed below, the Examiner's rejections are traversed and favorable consideration is requested.

As indicated in the Office Action,

I. **Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 15, 16 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) further in view of Huang (US 6052456).**

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, have been amended to establish the claimed subject matter to include: "each worksite defining a group of users having a common attribute required for requisitioning user selectable items including material related to the common attribute and associated with the worksite;". The specification discusses this feature

on page 6, lines 21-27. In addition, the validation rules are used to associate items of inventory with specific work sites that define a work group of users. For example, a work site can be based on the user's geographical location, as currently recited in claim 15 and claim 29, and the validation rules may be used to associate items of inventory based on the jurisdictional requirements of the work sites geographical location. Insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are good examples of items that have jurisdictional requirements based on state requirements.

In contrast, as stated in the last Office Action on page 4, line 16 to page 5, line 6, Huang teaches a telecommunication switch management system including a Full Group Privileges Access Mechanism for maintaining (a) authorized User ID's; (b) the date and time each User ID expires ...; (c) authorized Passwords ...; (d) the date and time each Password expires ...; (f) the User Group of which each user having an authorized User ID is a member ...; (h) the User Group or Groups authorized to execute each available command and access each available function."

Huang teaches a system similar to the prior art systems discussed in the background section of the Applicant's specification at page 2, first full paragraph, where a User ID configuration is used to enable access particular information. The User ID system requires a system administrator to maintain a database to include current User ID's and privileges.

The User ID system does not provide a system including a worksite defining a group of users sharing a common attribute, ex. user geographical location that provides the necessary information for enabling the user to request an item related or dependant on the common attribute. For example, a work site can be based on the user common attribute of geographical location where insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are items requested that are dependant on the common attribute, i.e. geographical location of the user.

Huang et al. teaches a system of User IDs, passwords, user groups based and User IDs which do not directly provide the relevant information necessary for associating a user with a worksite as claimed by the Applicant. With reference to the discussed common attribute of "user geographical location," the server would be required to maintain a list of User ID's associated with a particular geographical

location. The Applicant's claimed subject matter does not require a User ID list for item requisitions because the user is associated with the relevant work site based on an attribute, ex. geographical location, which is associated with the user requested items.

For the reasons discussed above, Huang et al. does not teach the claimed limitations as discussed in the last Office Action. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, claims 2, 4-12, 16 and 18-26 are not obvious over Holland et al. in view of Fields et al. Further in view of Huang et al.

The Examiner is respectively requested to withdraw this rejection.

II. Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6052456) in further view of Lee et al. (US 6611814).

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, including claims 13 and 27 respectively, have been amended to establish the claimed subject matter to include: "each worksite defining a group of users having a common attribute required for requisitioning user selectable items including material related to the common attribute and associated with the work site." The validation rules are used to associate items of inventory with specific work sites that define a work group of users. For example, a work site can be based on the user's geographical location and the validation rules may be used to associate items of inventory based on the jurisdictional requirements of the work sites geographical location. Insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are good examples of items that have jurisdictional requirements based on state requirements.

Accordingly, Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6052456) do not teach each and every element of claims 5 and 15. Therefore, the elements of claims 13 and 27, which depend from

claims 5 and 15 respectively, are not taught by Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 052456) in further view of Lee et al. (US 6611814).

The Examiner is respectively requested to withdraw this rejection.

III. Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6052456) in further view of Walker et al. (US 6466919).

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, including claims 14 and 28 respectively, have been amended to establish the claimed subject matter to include: “each worksite defining a group of users having a common attribute required for requisitioning user selectable items including material related to the common attribute and associated with the work site.” The validation rules are used to associate items of inventory with specific work sites that define a work group of users. For example, a work site can be based on the user’s geographical location and the validation rules may be used to associate items of inventory based on the jurisdictional requirements of the work sites geographical location. Insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are good examples of items that have jurisdictional requirements based on state requirements.

Accordingly, Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6052456) do not teach each and every element of claims 5 and 15. Therefore, the elements of claims 14 and 28, which depend from claims 5 and 17 respectively, are not taught by Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6052456) in further view of Walker et al. (US 6466919).

The Examiner is respectively requested to withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-29) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

The undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Jeffrey N. Zahn, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

4/16/2005
Date



Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
Jeffrey N. Zahn, Reg. No. 54,864
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

N:\XERZ\200395\US\dc0001818V001.doc